

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-4191**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DARIUS TREMAYNE BROOKS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, Jr., District Judge. (1:10-cr-00071-WO-1)

---

Submitted: July 28, 2011

Decided: August 1, 2011

---

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, John A. Dusenbury, Jr., Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Michael Francis Joseph, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Darius Tremayne Brooks pled guilty, pursuant to a written plea agreement, to possession of a firearm by a felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) (2006). Brooks was sentenced by the district court to ninety-six months' imprisonment. Appellate counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), in which he asserts there are no meritorious issues for appeal but questions the reasonableness of Brooks' sentence. Brooks filed a pro se supplemental brief, contending that the sentencing enhancements for armed robbery and kidnapping are erroneous because he believes he will be acquitted of the offenses when he goes to trial in state court. Finding no error, we affirm.

Appellate review of a sentence, "whether inside, just outside, or significantly outside the Guidelines range," is for abuse of discretion. Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 41 (2007). This review requires consideration of both the procedural and substantive reasonableness of a sentence. Id. at 51. This court must assess whether the district court properly calculated the advisory Guidelines range, considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2006) factors, analyzed any arguments presented by the parties, and sufficiently explained the selected sentence. Id. at 49-50; see also United States v. Lynn, 592 F.3d 572, 576 (4th Cir. 2010) ("[A]n individualized

explanation must accompany every sentence."); United States v. Carter, 564 F.3d 325, 330 (4th Cir. 2009). We may presume a sentence imposed within the properly calculated Guidelines range is reasonable. United States v. Mendoza-Mendoza, 597 F.3d 212, 217 (4th Cir. 2010).

We have reviewed the record with these standards in mind. Our examination leads us to conclude that Brooks' sentence is procedurally and substantively sound. Therefore, the district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing the chosen sentence.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm the judgment of the district court. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED